

I have records of both votes. It has been done before. It has been done by the majority party. It is just when they do not get 100 percent of their nominees, they do not get a rubber stamp coming out of this Chamber, that somehow they have a problem with that. The American people should not have a problem with it. The Constitution certainly does not have a problem with it, and I do not.

I want to be cooperative, but I do not want to sit and listen to a re-creation of reality that does not square with what we have done in the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wonder if I could ask unanimous consent to line up speakers. Does the Senator from North Dakota want to do that? And is that agreeable to the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oklahoma that speakers be lined up by unanimous consent? When I asked Senator DORGAN to yield to me for 5 minutes, he was wondering if he could then be next in order. But I know Senator BOND is here, too.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me follow Senator BOND.

Mr. INHOFE. Yes. If I could ask the Senator from North Dakota about how much time will he be using?

Mr. DORGAN. I intended to use 20 minutes. I would be happy to follow the Senator.

Mr. INHOFE. I would be close to that amount of time, too, so I will go ahead and wait. If I could lock in after the Senator from North Dakota, that is fine.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me suggest the Senator from Michigan begin, and then be followed by the Senator from Missouri, and then myself, followed by the Senator from Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that be the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLOTURE VOTES FOR JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, while Senator DORGAN is in the Chamber, he made reference to the fact there have been cloture votes required on judges throughout the years. I want to expand on the RECORD some of the names of judges where cloture votes were required, in fact, where cloture votes were not agreed to and led to their defeat in a number of instances: Justice Fortas in 1968; now Justice Bryer but then circuit court nominee Steven Bryer in 1980, with two cloture motions; Rosemary Barkett, to the Eleventh Circuit in 1994; Lee Sarokin in 1994, with a cloture motion required; Marsha Berzon in the year 2000; Richard Paez in the year 2000.

Cloture is not a new phenomenon when it comes to the debate over

judges. Yet we hear now that suddenly the requirement that there be a cloture vote is something that is new to this Senate. It is not. It has been historically used. It is appropriate, and it is rare.

As Senator DORGAN pointed out, 93 percent of the judges who were nominated by President Bush were confirmed when there were votes that came to the floor of the Senate. Ninety-three percent of these judges were confirmed. And the comparison to that of the Clinton years, where so many judges could not even get a hearing, where there was a filibuster in the Judiciary Committee because of the refusal to grant judges a hearing, is quite a contrast. We do not hear much about that. Instead, hearing that the refusal to have an up-or-down vote and a requirement for cloture is somehow labeled obstructionism is altogether out of line, as far as I am concerned, and inaccurate historically, inappropriate, and needs to be contested.

#### TRIBUTES TO RETIRING SENATORS

TOM DASCHLE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, that is not why I came to the floor, although it relates to why I came to the floor this afternoon because I came here to pay tribute to a dear friend, our Democratic leader, TOM DASCHLE of South Dakota. This sadness is only tempered by the belief that TOM DASCHLE will continue to play a vital role in our Nation's public life in the future.

TOM DASCHLE has had a distinguished career as a legislator on behalf of the interests of the people of South Dakota and all of the people of our Nation. He has fought for a fair share for the farmers of his State and for farmers around the country. He has been in the forefront of rural health, veterans' health, a fair tax system, and a very broad range of other issues.

He has been as a leader of the Democrats in the Senate, both as majority leader and minority leader, through one of the most difficult periods of the Senate's history where TOM DASCHLE has made his mark. He has been a remarkable leader. As a principled and tireless advocate for the issues he believes in, he has led by example. On countless difficult and contentious issues, he has led by carefully listening to all sides. Time and time again, on complex and challenging legislation, he has led by tireless negotiation and by building consensus. And, where appropriate, he has been able to organize Democrats to insist on our rights as a minority in the Senate.

It is, indeed, a bitter irony of the most recent election that TOM DASCHLE, who is a legislator to the core, and a man of compromise and soft-spoken wisdom, a seeker of dialogue, solutions, and consensus, was caricatured as an obstructionist. In the time-honored tradition of Senate leaders of both parties, he stood tall when

principle required it. In reality, though, it was TOM DASCHLE's style to reach across the aisle, time and time again, in an effort to legislate in the Nation's best interest. Often he worked closely with the Republican leader in some of the Senate's finest and most difficult hours.

In the face of a very difficult impeachment trial that tested this Senate, in response to the September 11 terrorist attacks, and when he himself was targeted in the anthrax attack, as in countless other instances, TOM DASCHLE demonstrated his talent for calm, inclusive, and wise leadership.

As this session of Congress ends in the next few days, the people of South Dakota will be losing a vigorous, effective, and committed Senator. Democrats in this body, indeed, all Senators, will be losing a great leader. And all Americans will be losing a voice of reason, judgment, and wisdom. I will be losing a friend and a confidante. TOM DASCHLE is a beautiful human being and a nonpareil leader. His good nature will enable him to overcome this momentary defeat so that the contributions he makes to public life will soon flower in a different place.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SHELBY be recognized for 10 minutes following me, and that Senator BREAUX be recognized for 15 minutes thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOHN BREAUX

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it has been a pleasure to work with the Senator from Louisiana. We have appreciated his leadership on many issues not only important to Louisiana but to our energy future and important to navigation in the heartland, which is something that is vitally important for all of us.

#### LEADERSHIP AT THE CIA

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about an old-fashioned virtue: doing what you said you were going to do. That is a test a lot of people apply in politics. They say if you tell us what you are going to do when you get elected, are you going to do it?

It seems to me in the intelligence field we have an example of that. The reaction is somewhat surprising. We have had, I think, 128 or 130 hearings in the Intelligence Committee since I joined it in January 2003. One of the lessons we learned is that, while there are many outstanding dedicated men and women in the CIA and throughout the intelligence community, the system is broken; it didn't give us the adequate or accurate prediction of the scope of the terrorist danger to the U.S. before 9/11. We went into Iraq with the Director of Central Intelligence so confident of the intelligence analysis